

Oil Company, that had the contract in the previous year, continued to deliver the oil just as they did before, and they have been delivering oil ever since. They delivered in the year for which Mr. Lodge got that contract, over \$27,000 worth of oil. And all that was done was simply this, the manager of the railway, by direction of the minister, turned over that contract to the Imperial Oil Company, and as the department had in hand already, under the previous contract, the cheque of the Imperial Oil Company, Mr. Lodge's unmarked cheque was returned to him.

Now Mr. Lodge was asked what consideration his company got for turning over that contract, and he refused to tell. It seems to be a peculiarity with everybody that deals with this government that their business is so private, so confidential, that they won't tell what they get for anything. But Mr. Lodge admits that the Imperial Oil Company paid a round sum in commission for turning over the contract. Now I, perhaps uncharitably, come to this conclusion, that Mr. Lodge, knowing that the Imperial Oil Company had that contract for the previous year, knowing that they wanted to continue that contract, just went to them and said, you stand aside and I will get the contract for you; you give me a commission, and you will be able to continue. And they did continue, not only for that year but for the year after, and as Mr. Lodge says, that contract is going on still, without any renewal.

Then tenders were asked for belting, and some eighteen tenders were received for various qualities of belting, and at different prices. There were two tenders received for the make of the J. C. MacLaren Belting Company; that I believe is a first-class quality of belting. Mr. Lodge, or the Supply Company that he represented, tendered for that quality of make, and so did Kennedy & Co., of Montreal. Mr. Lodge's tender was not the lowest, but the supply company he represented was awarded the contract by the minister, and that contract goes on for a year.

Now I would like to show the effect of the hon. gentleman's interference and meddling with the proper conduct of the business of the Intercolonial, and to show that when the minister undertakes to meddle his officers follow the example. The hon. gentleman interfered, he dictated practically as to where the purchases of that oil should be made. And when Mr. Lodge gets the contract for the belting, the deputy minister, following in the footsteps of the minister, also undertakes to tell what should be done in the next year. I will read his letter on that point. This letter is written to:

Dear Mr. Joughins.

You see it is not addressed as an ordinary official letter, it is addressed to 'Dear Mr.

Mr. BARKER.

Joughins' by the Deputy Minister of Railways.

If you require any additional belting for the coming year, will you be kind enough to order your supply from the J. C. MacLaren Belting Co., who I understand gave satisfactory results last year. You understand, of course, that belting is the same price from all manufacturers, the only question being that of quality, so that there is never anything to be gained by asking special prices.

Yours very truly,
M. J. BUTLER.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is Mr. Joughins?

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Joughins is the mechanical superintendent, the officer having control of this matter. Now the extraordinary thing about this letter is that it is contrary to the facts. They asked for tenders in the previous year and they received some eighteen or twenty tenders at different prices. They received tenders for this very quality of belting, and they gave the contract to Mr. Lodge, though he was not the lowest. Yet here in this letter, written some nine months after the contract, Mr. Butler coolly says: 'You understand, of course, that belting is the same price from all manufacturers, the only question being that of quality'. He did not see that anything was to be gained by asking special prices. Well, I cannot blame the deputy minister, nor can the minister blame him; he was not half as bad as the minister was himself, because I have no doubt that Mr. Butler had no personal interest in the matter, as the minister had. He did not interfere to the same extent. He wrote to 'Dear Mr. Joughins' in a friendly way. But nobody could mistake the minister's letter and telegram. The officers who received the minister's letter would know that they had to come down and do what they were told. Mr. Butler went as far as he could. He intimated from headquarters that Mr. Joughins was to let that contract go on for another year, without asking for tenders, and knowing as he must have known, and as Mr. Lodge said in his evidence, that the terms offered by a competitor of Mr. Lodge were better than Mr. Lodge's terms. So there is an example of No. 2.

Now, I will not go into the land case, because that was referred to by my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal, (Mr. Ames) in a previous debate. It was perhaps a more glaring case than any of these. But the purchasing of land is not quite so common as the buying of supplies for the Intercolonial. There is no practice in connection with the management of a railway more dangerous, more apt to cause fraud, cheating and roguery than interference with the officers in the proper performance of their duty. I do not care who it is, whether it is the minister or the deputy minister, he should be exceedingly careful about anything of that kind. Why does not Mr. Pottinger,